

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FIL	ING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/616,543	07/10/2003		H. Alexander Munroe II	5607-003	2813	
25184	7590	02/22/2006		EXAMINER		
WILLIAM			WATKINS III, WILLIAM P			
MACCORD POST OFFIC			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
WRIGHTSV	ILLE BEA	CH, NC 28480	1772			

DATE MAILED: 02/22/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)	
		10/616,543	MUNROE, H. ALEXANDER	
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
		William P. Watkins III	1772	
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address	
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DANSIONS OF time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1: SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. O period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period vere to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ti will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from , cause the application to become ABANDONI	N. mely filed not this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status				
1) 又	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>09 De</u>	<u>ecember 2005</u> .		
• —	·	action is non-final.		
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allowar	nce except for formal matters, pr	osecution as to the merits is	
	closed in accordance with the practice under E	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	53 O.G. 213.	
Disposit	ion of Claims			
4)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1,5-13,17-19 and 21-23</u> is/are pending	g in the application.		
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw			
5)	Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
6)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1, 5-13, 17-19 and 21-23</u> is/are reject	ed.		
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
8)□	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.		
Applicat	ion Papers			
9)[	The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.		
10)[	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acceptance	epted or b) objected to by the	Examiner.	
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).	
_	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct			•
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	caminer. Note the attached Office	e Action or form PTO-152.	
Priority (	under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign ☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a	ı)-(d) or (f).	
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents			
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents			
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior	·	ed in this National Stage	
	application from the International Bureau			
" `	See the attached detailed Office action for a list	or the certified copies not receiv	ea.	
Attachmer	nt(s)			
1) Notic	ce of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summar		
	ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)	Paper No(s)/Mail D	Date Patent Application (PTO-152)	
	er No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:	,	

Application/Control Number: 10/616,543 Page 2

Art Unit: 1772

## DETAILED ACTION

- 1. The rejections using Lindholm and Brewer in sections 7 and 8 in of the office action mailed 09 August 2005 are withdrawn in view of applicant's amendments to the claims filed 09 December 2005.
- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1, 5, 7-13, 22 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Montgomery, Sr. (U.S. 6,718,714 B1) in view of Betz (U.S. 5,587,218).

Montgomery, Sr. teaches warning tactile floor tile with bevels and screw holes for easy installation on a rigid support surface with a pattern of domes and raised strips that meets ADA standards or aide in guidance (abstract, Figure 3, Figure 16, col. 1, lines 50-60, col. 2, lines 25-40). Betz teaches the use

Art Unit: 1772

of a sheet which may be made of a flexible material such as rubber that has grooves to allow changes in indicia and dome structure in order to meet ADA tactile standards, that is secured to a rigid backing (col. 2, lines 40-60, abstract, Figure 4, col. 3, lines 15-30, col. 6, lines 5-30, col. 1, lines 45-55). The instant invention claims the use of a floor mat that can be rolled with tactile projections, screw holes and beveled edges. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have made the tiles of Montgomery, Sr. out of a flexible sheet material with grooves in order to allow variation in indicia and dome configuration because of the teachings of Betz. The examiner takes the flexible sheet material of Betz as being capable of being transported in roll form. Betz teaches rubber and other materials for use in flexible sheet structures (col. 1, lines 45-55). Variation in the size of the flexible sheet of the combination is taken as being within the ordinary skill of the art.

4. Claims 6 and 17-19 and 21 are rejected under 35
U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Montgomery, Sr. in view of Betz as applied to claims 1, 3-5 and 7-16 above, and further in view of Koski (U.S. 5,010,122).

Application/Control Number: 10/616,543

Art Unit: 1772

Koski et al. teach using recycled tire cord and rubber as a material to mold floor mats (abstract, col. 3, lines 30-40, col. 5, lines 40-50). The instant invention claims a flexible warning mat made of recycled tire cord. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have made used recycled tire material in the mat of Montgomery, Sr. in view of Betz in order to have the cost and environmental advantages of recycled material because of the teachings of Koski et al.

5. Applicant's arguments filed 09 December 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that there is no teaching of horizontal rows and vertical columns of raised domes or of aligned and spaced holes for installation of anchors. The raised domes of Montgomery, Sr. as shown in such as Figures 1, 3, and 4 are clearly aligned in horizontal rows and vertical columns. The anchors of Montgomery, Sr. such as elements 94 in Figures 16 and 9 are screws, which pass through holes in the mat. These holes are aligned and spaced along the edges of the mat and serve as guides for the screws. Montgomery, Sr. teaches raised bars (col. 2, lines 35 through 40), which can be considered as raised strips. Betz also teaches grooves which define strips which

Application/Control Number: 10/616,543 Page 5

Art Unit: 1772

protrude from the surface defined by the bottom of the grooves.

Thus all limitations argued by applicant are taught by the combination of the references.

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William

Art Unit: 1772

P. Watkins III whose telephone number is 571-272-1503. The examiner works an increased flex time schedule, but can normally be reached Monday through Friday, 11:30 A.M. through 8:00 P.M. Eastern Time. The examiner returns all calls within one business day unless an extended absence is noted on his voice mail greeting.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Harold Pyon can be reached on 571-272-1498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR of Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <a href="http://pair-direct.uspto.gov">http://pair-direct.uspto.gov</a>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

WW/ww February 20, 2006

WILLIAM P. WATKINS III PRIMARY EXAMINER

Wellian A. Watter

Page 6